

Shakespeare and Music

Cunningham, John

New Oxford Shakespeare

Published: 27/10/2016

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Cunningham, J. (2016). Shakespeare and Music. In G. Taylor, J. Jowett, T. Bourus, & G. Egan (Eds.), *New Oxford Shakespeare : The Complete Works* (Modern Critical Edition ed.). Oxford: OUP.

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Editorial problems of transcribing and editing and interpreting early music texts

Introduction: scope of the edition

The importance of music to Shakespeare's works has long been recognised. The five-volume *A Shakespeare Music Catalogue* (1991) stands as a monumental reminder of the music that Shakespeare's works have generated, from his time to our own. The *Catalogue* also serves as a reminder of the body of research which the subject has produced, especially over the last fifty or so years. In addition to the *Catalogue*, particular attention must be drawn to John H. Long's trilogy on *Shakespeare's Use of Music*, F. W. Sternfeld's *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy*, Peter Seng's *The Vocal Songs in the Plays of Shakespeare*, Claude Simpson, *The British Broadside Ballad and its Music*, Andrew Charlton's *Music in the Plays of Shakespeare: a Practicum*, Ross Duffin's *Shakespeare's Songbook*, and Christopher R. Wilson's *Music in Shakespeare*. Shakespeare's music (or rather, music associated with Shakespeare) has thus been identified, catalogued, analysed, re-imagined, and in some cases (re-)invented. The debt of any editor to these studies (and the many others listed in the bibliography) is great.

The present edition includes all of the music that can be reasonably associated with contemporary performances of Shakespeare's plays. It also includes the few settings of Shakespeare's texts (songs and poems) that date from the first half of the seventeenth century, but which are not associated with the theatre. The tunes of ballads and settings of popular songs that are directly quoted (in speech or song) have also been provided, but only where the tune can be firmly identified: in this aspect especially the debt to previous studies is significant.

Concern for recovering the music heard in early modern productions began in the late nineteenth century. The Tercentenary of 1864 indirectly inspired two important publications. In 1878 Alfred Roffe's *The Handbook of Shakespearean Music* was posthumously published; it was one of the earliest publications to include (quoting the subtitle) *Compositions ranging from the Elizabethan Age to the Present Time*. It was followed in 1884 by *A List of All the Songs and Passages in Shakespeare*, compiled by J. Greenhill, the Rev. W. A. Harrison and F. J. Furnivall, which included the settings published in John Wilson's *Cheerfull Ayres* (1660). It was not, however, until the early twentieth century that there developed a significant interest into researching and locating the music of Shakespeare's time, itself an outgrowth of the burgeoning 'early music' movement. One of the most significant early studies in this vein was E. W. Naylor's *Shakespearean Music* (1913).

In the hundred years since the publication of Naylor's seminal study our understanding of Shakespearean music and its sources has increased exponentially, and continues to inspire new research. One of the most exciting current projects is Christopher R. Wilson's in-progress database (www.shakespeare-music.hull.ac.uk), which 'attempts to identify every music reference in context in each play and in a number of poems where they occur'. On one hand this kind of forensic examination confirms the extent to which music permeated Shakespeare's works; on the other, it makes strikingly clear just how little has survived. In part this stems from the fact that much of the music heard in Shakespeare's theatre was not notated (e.g. the short trumpet flourishes that accompanied the entrance or exit of a character of royal or noble birth). In part it stems from the ephemeral nature of theatre music, very little of which was printed. Theatre songs likely circulated on single, loose pages, ill-prepared for longevity (this is reinforced by the very few examples of singing parts from theatre productions that survive from the later eighteenth century). Even if they were compiled and preserved by acting companies their libraries have long since perished. What comes to us today are remnants preserved only at several removes in various song manuscripts often compiled for an entirely different (domestic or private) context.

Defining terms: 'formal' and 'impromptu'

In play-texts songs are generally indicated by stage directions (e.g. 'Music', 'Song') and / or italics. The vocal music heard in plays may be broadly categorised as 'formal' and 'impromptu'. Impromptu songs are typically quotations from ballads and popular songs; the tunes would have been well known the audience and as such could function on multiple reference levels. These songs vary in

length, from a line or two to more or less complete renditions. Mad songs (Ophelia's are the famous example) would also fall into this category. Formal songs have been succinctly described by David Lindley as 'explicitly called for and performed as complete wholes to an audience on-stage and off. ... They are "framed" events, and often the way they are situated and commented upon may be as important as the direct effect they have as musical performance' (2005: 168–169). Formal songs may generally be equated with 'art' songs: in other words, notated settings specifically composed for a particular set of words. Ballads – quoted directly or presented in parody – were associated with a tune, and one tune would often serve several ballads. This might seem to imply an ideological divide between what we may loosely describe as 'art' and 'folk' music, between music that was disseminated primarily in notation or as part of an oral tradition. However, this type of separation is artificial: the boundaries between them were by no means as clear-cut as they are today, as demonstrated for example by the number of popular tunes (such as 'Walsingham') used as the subject for notated variations.

Authors, authority, and attribution

The way in which music was used in the early modern theatre developed from physical considerations of the performance space and through the actors (Lindley, 2005 is the best introduction to the subject). The public theatres were relatively large, open-roofed structures usually in a circular or polygonal shape. The audience was diverse: seats in the galleries were relatively expensive, though standing in the yard was affordable to most. The plays were acted by men (with boys taking any female roles), and tended to be quite broad in their appeal. The private theatres, by contrast, were small, enclosed, rectangular, and fully seated; admission costs were higher and more exclusive. The actors were children, largely drawn from the choristers of St Paul's Cathedral and from the Chapel Royal. The plays presented by the children's companies tended to have more songs and music than those of the adult companies. The adult companies were not unmusical, but until about 1608 there was little need for sophisticated music in the plays of the adult companies. Of course, music was more clearly audible in the indoor theatres than in their outdoor counterparts. The children's companies performed instrumental music before plays and between the acts, as the candles were being trimmed. Plays performed by the adult companies generally offered only incidental music, although their audiences also expected to hear stage jigs (bawdy entertainments that included music, song, and dance).

With the suppression of the Queen's Revel's Children in 1608 the King's Men took over the Blackfriars and were able to absorb some of the child actors. The acquisition of the Blackfriars also meant that the company inherited the mixed consort of lute, flute, bandora, cittern, bass viol and treble viol. The consort was comprised of court musicians and provided inter-act music: a tradition that became part of the outdoor theatres in the second decade of the century. In general it is virtually impossible to connect instrumental pieces to specific plays, though the type of repertoire performed is represented by the printed collections of Thomas Morley – *Consort Lessons* (1599; 2/1611) – and Philip Rosseter – *Lessons for Consort* (1609).

With these additional resources, it is no coincidence that in Shakespeare's late plays we notice an increase in the number of songs that survive in contemporary settings, most of which are attributed to Robert Johnson. We know few details of his life.¹ After serving a seven-year apprenticeship in the household of the Lord Chamberlain, Sir George Carey (1547–1603), in 1604 Johnson secured an official post in the Royal Music as a lutenist. Carey was Lord Chamberlain from 1596 until his death, and so patron of the Lord Chamberlain's Men (the King's Men after 1603). In addition to his court duties, it seems that Johnson (d.1633) was engaged to write songs for the King's Men from around the time that they took over the Blackfriars; the association was informal but apparently regular until c.1617. He may have shared the task of writing for the company for a time with John Wilson (1595–1674), especially if we believe that his setting of 'Lawn as white as driven snow' was heard in first performances of *The Winter's Tale*: it seems much more likely that it was written for a revival, however. By 1617 Wilson appears to have replaced Johnson as the main

songwriter for the King's Men. Tradition has it that our man may be the 'Jacke Wilson' referred to in the first Folio of *Much Ado about Nothing*. His association with the company lasted until about 1634, the year before he finally secured a post in the Royal Music. A staunch Royalist, he moved with the court to Oxford in 1642; in 1644 he graduated DMus at Oxford, and was made Heather Professor of Music there in 1656. Of the fifty or so settings of songs from the company's plays that survive from *The Winter's Tale* to the end of the 1620s all but a few appear to have been written by Johnson and Wilson. Johnson was by far the more skilful composer – Wilson's settings suffer by comparison, but are not without merit.

Despite the attribution to Johnson of 18 songs from King's Men plays he remains a shadowy figure. Indeed, many of the attributions are based on the circular assumption that Johnson was writing for the company during the period. Of the seven songs from Shakespearean plays usually attributed to him only four bear his name in contemporary sources: 'Hark, hark the lark' (?) from *Cymbeline* (c.1609?); 'Come away, Hecate' (?) from *Macbeth* (via Middleton's *The Witch* (1609)); 'Get you hence' (?) from *The Winter's Tale* (c.1611); 'Full fathom five' and 'Where the bee sucks' from *The Tempest* (1611); and 'Wood, rocks and mountains' and 'Endless tears' which may have been sung in *Cardenio* (1613). The songs are short which makes stylistic attribution difficult, but overall the attribution seems certain enough.

Of course even where the name of a composer is given we cannot assume that they are taking (or being given) authorship of the song itself. In the early modern period composers and copyists rarely maintained a distinction between what we today might terms 'composition' and 'arrangement' (see Cunningham, 2013). For example, one of the main sources for Johnson's *Tempest* songs is Wilson's printed collection, *Cheerfull Ayres* (1660), where they are arranged as part-songs. Shakespeare's name is nowhere to be found; Johnson's name appears in the Cantus Primus book (i.e. that containing the main melodic line, with an unfigured continuo part), while Wilson's appears with the Cantus Secundus and Bassus partbooks. In the preface Wilson explains that 'Some few of these Ayres [i.e. tunes] were Originally composed by those whose names are affixed to them, but are here placed as being new set by the Author of the rest [i.e. Wilson himself]'. The intention was to maximise sales by appealing to as wide an audience as possible.²

A more complex case is 'O mistress mine' (*Twelfth Night*, c.1601). Arguably one of the most well-known Shakespearean songs, its status has long been asserted and questioned. The dramatic context suggests that Shakespeare was quoting a popular song, though it has not survived in its original form. Since the mid-nineteenth century scholarly tradition held that the song was sung to the tune 'O mistress mine' found in Morley's *First Booke of Consort Lessons* (1599; 2/1611). Morley's collection seems to have its origins in the Blackfriars: it includes, for example, two tunes specifically called for in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. A number of the items are arrangements of songs and it is highly likely that 'O mistress mine' also originated as a song.

The discovery of the same tune in a further two sources cast doubt on the Shakespeare connection (for a summary, see Seng, 1967: 98–100). The tune was used as the basis for a set of keyboard variations by William Byrd, probably written around the turn of the century and also titled 'O mistress mine'. It was also discovered in a third source, John Gamble's commonplace book (New York Public Library, Drexel MS 4257), where it is sets a poem 'Long have mine eyes gazed with delight' sometimes attributed to Thomas Campion, but more likely to be by Philip Rosseter. The situation is further complicated by what appears to be a reference to Byrd's arrangement of the tune in the inventory to a manuscript formerly owned by Thomas Tomkins (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS Rés. 1122), where it is listed as 'mr Birds o mistris myne I must'. This has been taken by some (e.g. Stern, 2014) as confirming that Morley's title was truncated and misleading (it should be noted that there are a number of songs beginning 'O mistress mine').

There is also some disparity between the structure of the stanzas and the musical structure of Morley's tune. Shakespeare's text has six lines, but this structure is not found in any of the three music sources: the Morley arrangement would accommodate an eight-line stanza and the Byrd setting accommodates a seven-line stanza; the Gamble setting uses a five-line stanza. The four

musical phrases also each appear in different orders: AABCDBCD (Morley), AABCD CD (Byrd), and AABCD (Gamble). This means that none of the settings provide a natural fit for the six lines given by Shakespeare: a problem that has long taxed editors. Various editions have forced a marriage between Morley's tune and Shakespeare's text by repeating the first one or two lines of the text: an anachronistic solution. Duffin (2004) suggests that musical repetition is the solution, and this is certainly preferable. The solution chosen for this edition was to omit two of the musical phrases, giving an AADBCD structure (which then becomes AABCDB).

The attribution to Byrd in the Fitzwilliam manuscript is also taken as evidence of the problematic nature of the tune, though it is important to understand the nature of the authorship that is being asserted; the attribution refers to the variations on the theme, and not to the theme itself. There is nothing to even suggest that Morley composed the tune. The full title of his collection makes it clear that he was not necessarily claiming authorship of the tunes but of the arrangements.³ Morley tells us that the lessons were '*made* [i.e. composed] *by diuers exqui-site Authors*' and '*Newly set forth* [i.e. arranged]' by him.

Although we cannot be certain that the tune printed by Morley was that used in *Twelfth Night* (one way or the other), the arguments against it are far from convincing. For one thing it assumes that Morley's arrangement of the tune reflects the original song exactly and thus gives too much authority to the surviving texts as documents of record. And, the appearance of a slightly extended title in one source may simply suggest that the tune was set to another similar text or that the copyist erred in transcription. It is worth highlighting that the Tomkins manuscript cannot be dated to before 1646. Morley's arrangement is at least the earliest, and notwithstanding the structural issue the tune fits the text rather well. Indeed, perhaps it is the Folio that preserves the omission, and not the musical sources.

The myth of canonicity

Such issues surrounding authorship and the association with original productions are compounded for the editor by the fact that in most cases songs survive in sources that post-date the original performances of the plays, in some cases by decades. Moreover, acknowledging the circumstantial (and in some ways circular) arguments associating Johnson with the King's Men one is forced to concede that we do not know for certain that the body of theatre songs did in fact originate in the theatre. One strongly suspects that they did, but the best we can say is that these songs (as well as others) survive in near contemporary sources and may represent something like the song as it was heard in the theatre. The point is made not to undermine the available evidence, but rather to caution against reading too much into that evidence simply because it is scarce.

The Morley connection is a case in point. More famous than 'O mistress mine' is Morley's setting of 'It was a lover and his lass' from his *First Booke of Ayres* (1600). *As You Like It* was entered in the Stationer's Register on 4 August 1600, and Morley's book must have been entered around the same time. The contention is whether Morley wrote the song for the play or whether Shakespeare used it as a popular, well-known song. Indeed, it is possible that the Morley composed his own setting of the song, independent to but contemporaneous with the play. Morley is best known for eleven printed collections, the first of which appeared in 1593. By the turn of the century he was living in the same parish as Shakespeare, St Helen's, Bishopgate, which has fuelled speculation that the two men were personally acquainted. Given the close chronological proximity of the print and the play (and the two men), scholarly tradition has long asserted that this is one of few formal songs from the plays that survive in what appears to be an original setting. However, in truth there is no good evidence either way, especially as the play was not published until 1623.

Fundamentally any suggestion of creative collaboration between Shakespeare and composers such as Johnson or Morley rests upon the notion that music was specifically composed for theatre songs. This obviously reflects our necessary bias for notation and a pragmatic absorption of the available evidence. Recently, however, this idea has been challenged: in particular by David Lindley and Ross Duffin, who have essentially argued that the paucity of notated settings of formal songs

may be because in the majority of cases there settings were not newly composed for the public theatre. Instead song texts were adapted to existing popular or ballad tunes. The idea is not particularly new (a similar theory was advanced as early as 1964 by John Stevens who concluded that Shakespeare and his contemporaries 'adapted music that was already to hand' (1964: 28)), but with the publication of Duffin's *Shakespeare's Songbook* its potential has been deftly demonstrated. Some marriages are more successful than others, but the *Songbook* certainly proves the adaptability of song texts to the popular repertoire. It also provides credible reconstructions for the songs for which no contemporary settings are known. Indeed, the principle that underlines the *Songbook* has the advantage of explaining why such a high proportion of songs from the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries have not survived: they were not notated in the first instance. Re-using material might also have been practical, given that actors in the adult companies had limited time to learn new songs.

The truth probably lies somewhere in the middle. One suspects that there was a good deal of reliance on pre-existing music, especially pre-1608. The events of that year, briefly exposed above, seem to have led to a shift towards newly composed settings in the public theatres and a greater use of music generally; though this could depend on the availability of appropriately skilled actors **form** one performance to the next. While the demands of the repertory system were heavy, it would not have precluded learning songs. Especially as actors leant their parts and rehearsed individually (see Palfrey and Stern, 2007). And there is nothing to suggest that the surviving songs would have taken particularly long to create, much less learn.

Formatted: Highlight

Editorial challenges

Transcribing and editing most of the formal songs is a straightforward task (editing the Impromptu songs is a slightly different beast and so discussed separately, below). Many of the songs survive in single sources. While this settles the copy-text question, it obviously does not allow for verification of problematic passages. The editor instead has to amend any seemingly incorrect aspects according to the style of the period and what is known of the composer, presenting a final and authoritative text reflecting what may be broadly known as the composer's intentions. Depending on the source, this may entail supplying omitted accidentals, misplaced tablature letters, correcting points of 'bad grammar' or simply 'wrong' notes, dealing with barring (irregular and omitted), and in some cases reconstruction of missing sections or parts. Proper underlay of the text can also be challenging, depending on the source.

Although an editor will typically intervene only as necessary (and must make clear where any such action has been taken), it is important not to put one's trust fully in the sources and accept their readings without question. In general the sources of the songs included in this edition are reasonably accurate. The notation itself poses few challenges, though it can be deceptively similar to modern notation. Triple metres in particular can be widely varied in sources, exhibiting lingering effects of mensural notation. It was not until around the middle of the seventeenth century that it became conventional for barlines to be written immediately before the main beat: some sources are barred irregularly, while in others barlines are omitted entirely. Copyists also tended to be inconsistent (and sometimes parsimonious) way in which they supplied accidentals. Several of the items in the edition are notated in tablature, which instead of indicating a precise pitch tells the player where to place their finger(s) on the fretboard of instruments such as the cittern, viol or lute. While tablature facilitates performance, it can be difficult to visualise its relationship to the staff notation; thus it is advisable to provide staff notation transcriptions which attempt to make clear the implied voice-leading. Any such transcription (or transliteration) requires a good deal of interpretation on the part of the editor.

Multiple sources force the editor to prefer one over the rest. In an ideal situation the source(s) closest to the composer would be chosen. This would be an autograph manuscript or a print published under his authority, or indeed a manuscript copied under the composer's supervision (such as John Wilson's songbook, Bodleian Library, MS Mus. Sch. B.1). We can assume, for example,

that Thomas Morley's printed collections are an accurate reflection of his intentions (though not necessarily those of Shakespeare). However, the main songwriter for the King's Men during Shakespeare's lifetime, Robert Johnson, left no known autographs, nor was any of his songs printed during his lifetime. In the absence of such materials the editor will generally prefer the earliest source, and if possible supply corrections from one of the cognates. In some cases the earlier source may present a less competent version of the piece than a later one or it may be lacking in some details, which may force the editor to choose the later source. For example, the later source of 'Get ye hence' offers a more coherent reading than the earlier one, which appears to capture some elements of a live performance; similarly the earliest source for 'Wind, rocks, and mountains' appears to be corrupt in some aspects, and one of the later sources (Add. 11608) includes a second stanza not found in either of the other two sources. Of course, in both instances the earliest source still post-dates original performances of the play by a decade or so.

Background variation

Music sources are often of interest in terms of the dissemination of the literary text. Henry Lawes's setting of sonnet 116 is an extreme example. The setting is found in John Gamble's commonplace book (New York Public Library, Drexel MS 4257) and probably dates to the early 1630s. It preserves seven lines from the original sonnet, varies the remaining seven, and includes two new couplets. The original sonnet is thus rendered as three six-line stanzas. The additional stanzas generally fit the music, but require some adjustment: this is a common feature of strophic songs. The setting was brought to light by Willa McClung Evans, who suggested that the variant text could have reached Lawes as one of (or a version of) the so-called 'sugared sonnets' but concluded that it was more likely that Lawes came across the sonnet after its publication in 1609 with the changes made to make it more malleable for setting to music (1936: 122). Either way, the sonnet 116 setting demonstrates how little we know of the process of creation of the song repertoire, and tells us a great deal about the fixity of texts. Two further examples reinforce the point: one of the sources for 'Get ye hence' (*Winter's Tale*) has an additional stanza not found elsewhere, and Thomas Ford's part-song setting of 'Sigh no more ladies' (~~*Measure for Measure*~~*Much Ado About Nothing*) includes two additional stanzas.

Most music settings of texts that originate in other contexts (plays, masques, poem collections) will reveal variants when compared to the literary source (e.g. the printed quarto or folio). By their nature, music sources are often inconsistent in approach to punctuation and orthography, though this does not result in aurally significant variants. More important is the way in which words were disseminated. It is a rare case that a music source presents the same reading as the printed quarto or folio. There are a number of ways in which to explain this. In the first instance, we must bear in mind that the way in which the songs survive is at least one remove from the composer, which means that we have to trust that whoever copied the song into the surviving source did so accurately. As Tiffany Stern has recently pointed out, songs were composed away from the body of the play. The text was written on a separate document, which would have been conveyed to the composer (see Palfrey and Stern, 2007; Stern, 2009). The composer would have re-written the text on a manuscript with music staves and then entered the music. This naturally introduces an opportunity for the text to be altered for a variety of reasons (e.g. illegibility, musical licence, carelessness). But it could also mean that the text was altered at the other end, as the musical document would never have formed part of the completed play. It raises the question: did playwrights and poets have an expectation of accuracy when it came to musical settings?

In point of fact, most of the variants between sources can be explained as 'background variation'.⁴ Although the concept developed in relation to late seventeenth-century music, in many ways it applies equally to the early part of the century. It essentially means that composers allowed for a certain degree of flexibility in the details of melodic lines during the process of transmission, and would not have understood such divergences as significant in terms of the identity of the piece. This could also be related to literary texts and the relationship between play scripts etc. and the more freely circulating elements such as songs.

Often the aurally significant variants in songs are localised to individual words: for example, in Morley's setting of 'It was a lover and his lass' he gives the 'cornfield' as plural and rendered 'country folk' as 'country fools'. Such instances are easily explainable and could simply be due to scribal error or an error on the part of the typesetter (rather than, say, revealing Morley's true feelings of his rustic counterparts). More significant is the change to the first line of the last stanza from 'And therefore take the present time' to 'Then pretty lovers take the time' (stanzas 2 and 3 are given as block text at the end of the song). The structure of the line is retained but the change could hardly be the result of scribal error. Either it resulted from deliberate action by Morley (or indeed the typesetter), or one of the lines represents a revision to the original text by Shakespeare. The other alternative is that Shakespeare misquoted Morley.

A different type of variant may be found in 'Hark, hark, the lark' (*Cymbeline*), which survives in a single source (Bodleian Library, MS Don.c.57), copied c.1620–50. When compared to the Folio, the song reveals minor variants (the opening line is subjected to internal repetition typical of songs; the repetition of the final word is omitted; 'arise' becomes 'to rise'; 'And winking' becomes 'The winking'). However, the lines 'His Steeds to water at those Springs / on chalic'd Flow'rs that lies:' are omitted. Three possibilities immediately suggest themselves: (a) the lines were deliberately omitted by the composer, though it is difficult to see why, unless the text was being fitted to the tune in a Procrustean fashion (as suggested by Seng, 1967), which seems unlikely; (b) the bars containing the missing lines were erroneously omitted by the copyist; this type of error is commonly found in instrumental music, but is harder to happen in a song because of the way in which vocal music was usually copied. First the text was written out with appropriate spacing, with the music then added (rather than adding all parts bar-by-bar); (c) the omitted lines were not in the source from which the composer worked in creating the song, which has implications for the song's text if we assume that it represents something of the song that was heard in original performances. Of course, the setting may not have anything to do with the song sung in the play, which may be the simplest explanation.

The degree of variance between sources can sometimes be suggestive of the function of the source(s). For example, the editors of the *Middleton Complete Works* suggested that one of the two settings of 'Come away, Hecate' originated from a copy perhaps arranged by a prompter or by the singers themselves (Taylor and Lavagnino, 2007: 157). While it is not clear that a prompter's copy would have included music, the suggestion is intriguing: hence it has been used here as the copy-text for the edition. While 'Come away, Hecate' was added to *Macbeth* through Middleton's adaptation, similar observations can be made of Autolycus's song 'Get ye hence' from *The Winter's Tale*, which also survives in two manuscripts: New York Public Library, Drexel MS 4041 (copied in the 1640s) and Drexel MS 4175 (copied in the 1620s). Despite a number of surface variants (including key, embellishments, harmony, text), the two sources clearly preserve the same setting. Although the later of the two, the Drexel 4041 setting seems to be the better text, although it is incomplete. The first stanza is given with the music; the additional text is laid out under unused staves as though it was going to be underlain. The vocal line covers a very wide range, indicating two singers; the shift from bass clef to treble clef at bar 5 corresponds with the change of character from Autolycus to Dorcas. Indeed, almost all of the character changes are indicated in the manuscript through the insertion of clefs (even where the clef does not change it is rewritten at points corresponding to character changes, as a type of visual cue): this seems to reinforce the suggestion that the surviving sources represent something of the original. Drexel 4041 also has a second stanza that may not be original: it has been suggested (e.g. Spink, 1974) that this may be what the clown was referring to with the line 'We'll have this song out anon by ourselves'. It is, however, unlikely that the additional stanza was intended to be sung to the same music as that which is given. The text has been written out in full (rather than as block text), suggesting at least some changes. Judging by the layout of the manuscript for the additional stanza (only the text is entered), the line 'in some darke darke Corner weeping' was sung as a duo, and 'then whither, whither, go'st thou whither' (f. 132v) was sung as a trio. This may well reflect the way in which it was sung on the stage by Autolycus, Mopsa and Dorcas.

Ornamentation and accompaniment

The sources of 'Get ye hence' also raise an interesting question in relation to performance practice. If we are to take Drexel 4175 at face value it suggests that the singers were accompanied by a lyra-viol and that the melodic line was sung with embellishments. There are two points at issue here: ornamentation and accompaniment.

In *Shakespeare's Songbook*, Duffin gives the melodic lines only for the songs even where they are drawn from more elaborate settings. Naturally, presenting the songs without an accompaniment reinforces Duffin's assertions that most of the formal songs were sung to ballad tunes (which generally do not survive with consistent harmonic accompaniments). It is true that impromptu songs would presumably have been sung for the most part unaccompanied on the stage, as they would have been in the streets by ballad-sellers. Stage directions are sometimes helpful in determining whether the actor was accompanied by an instrument on-stage, even when singing a popular tune. For example, the 'bad' quarto (1603) of *Hamlet* describes Ophelia entering 'distracted, playing on a lute, and her hair down, singing'. She goes on to sing 'How should I your true love know', which appears to refer to the popular tune 'Walsingham'. The tune is found in a variety of sources for lute and keyboard; it is possible that the actor realized a basic chordal accompaniment or perhaps just played the tune. Given the context, one would perhaps expect the lute to be equally out of tune.

Theatrical practicalities also highlight the process of adaptation from stage to page (or vice versa). The famous setting of the 'willow song' (*Othello*) is found in British Library, Add. MS 15117, with a fairly complex lute accompaniment. In the play, it is, however, sung by Desdemona while she is being undressed by Emilia: obviously neither could be playing an instrument, and it would make little sense for one to be played off-stage. As David Lindley makes clear, it is important to understand that any incidental music heard on the early modern stage was 'always part of the world of the play itself, heard and responded to by the characters on-stage' (2005: 112). Of course, this only matters if one attempts to argue that Add. MS 15117 preserves the version as sung in the theatre. In truth, if there is a connection it is indirect. Surviving sources of theatre songs are at least one remove from the playhouse and presumably indicate a process of adaptation as we have seen with 'Come away, Hecate' or 'Get ye hence'. Even if Morley's setting of 'It was a lover and his lass' was used in *As You Like It*, the printed song represents an arrangement for the domestic market, and there is good reason to think that such publications represent a more formal and polished version of the songs than was heard in the theatre (see also Kenny, 2008). In the play, the stage directions call for both Pages to sing (with no mention of accompaniment) but Morley's setting is for a single voice. Adaptation – in either direction – would be straightforward. Long (1955: 155), for example, plausibly suggested that the pages sang each stanza in alternation with both singing the refrains.

While accompaniment can often be deduced from the context, it is not clear to what extent – if any – songs were embellished in the theatre through ornamentation. In the early modern period embellishment (through what were known as 'graces' or 'divisions') was a commonplace of musical sophistication. In other words the notation of songs may be considered a descriptive framework rather than a proscriptive text. Most of the songs presented in this edition are preserved with few embellishments. But does this necessarily reflect performance practice? And what of those songs that are highly embellished?

The most relevant example from this edition is 'Rocks, wind and mountains' which may have been sung in *Cardenio*. The song is found with many embellishments in John Hilton's manuscript, British Library Add. MS 11608. Hilton added a number of embellishments to the basic melody of the opening stanza. But also wrote out the entire second stanza with an even more embellished version of the melody. It demonstrates clearly the principle that embellishments were intended to become more complex with each iteration of the tune (this is clearly outlined in Christopher Simpson's *The Division Viol*, for example). Such embellishments are best described as frozen improvisations: they are attempts to notate as faithfully as possible within the limitations of the notation how a singer might embellish a line; this would naturally depend on skill as well as context. Neither of the other two sources of the song have similar embellishments. Indeed, Mary Chan (1979) has convincingly

demonstrated that Hilton's manuscript was not associated with the theatre: it presumably represents performance practice of mid-century music societies, rather than early seventeenth-century theatres. However, there are a number of songs from plays in the King's Men's repertoire that are also found in several manuscript versions (further examples of background variation): the most famous example is 'Have you seen the bright lily' from Jonson's *Volpone* (1616). The song is found in seven contemporary manuscripts, several of which appear to record a frozen improvisation, a singer's interpretation of the song. As with 'Get ye hence', the copyists struggled with recording the embellishments – and the implied rhythmic flexibility – within the confines of the notation.

Some scholars (e.g. Fuller, 1977) have argued that these elaborate settings were inappropriate for the theatre. But again, one suspects that it depended on the context. There is, for example, an intriguing description of the first song in *Double Falsehood* / *Cardenio*: '... the sound of a voice, which without being accompanied by any instrument, did resound so sweet and melodiously, as they remained greatly admired, because they esteemed not that to be a place wherein any so good Musitian might make his abode. For although it is visually said, that in the woods and fields are found Shepherds of excellent voices, yet is this rather a Poetical indeerment, than an approved truth; and most of al when they perceiued that the verses they heard him singing were not of rusticke composition, but rather of delicate and Courtly inuention ...' (quoted in Hammond, 2010, 329–331). Although the song was unaccompanied (though an unfigured continuo line is given in the sources), there is a strong implication here that the 'delicate and Courtly inuention' was at least partly conveyed through the singing style. This seems to suggest some level of improvised virtuosity. Virtuosity is most readily associated with court culture.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries 'invention' (*inventio*) was understood as conveying 'an idea of rediscovery rather than pure creativity – of re-articulating and using something already known' (Hallett, 2013: 118). It was, for example, applied specifically to the performance of improvised divisions (i.e. the improvised re-creation of an existing melody) by Thomas Mace in *Musick's Monument* (1676): for example, 'he [the performer] will have *Inventions come flowing in upon him, with so much Ease, and Freedom*, that his greatest Trouble will be, *to Retain, Remember, or Set Them down, in Good Order* (123). While Hilton's embellishments of the melodic line appear to be representative of his activities as a performer in the middle decades of the century, they may illustrate some form of the song in performance. Of course, the performance depends on the actor's singing abilities. For example, Stern has described how Shakespeare appears to have revised the exchange between Arviragus and Guiderius in *Cymbeline* (4.2) from a song sung by both to a song sung by one and spoken by the other, and finally as a song read by both (2009: 146).

Impromptu songs

Editing impromptu songs presents different challenges to formal songs. The identification of sources of tunes has been greatly facilitated by the path-breaking research of scholars such as Claude Simpson, F. W. Sternfeld, John M. Ward, and more recently Ross Duffin. In general ballad tunes referenced by impromptu songs are found in lute or keyboard manuscripts, where they may have simple harmonisations and or have been used as the basis for variations. The editorial task is two-fold: (1) to establish a version of the tune that represents something recognisable to Shakespeare and his contemporaries; (2) to suggest a potential way in which the text may be fitted to the tune. For use with text it is often requires slight modification of the melody. As ballads and popular songs tend to be mostly syllabic, it is generally necessary to simplify the tune by removing melodic embellishments (i.e. divisions). Register and pitch are also potentially problematic; the lyra-viol, for example, had a wide range and octave shifts were idiomatic. The transcriptions in this edition have been transposed as necessary to fit into a singable range, but pitch should be considered relative just as rhythm should be flexible. Adding texts to these melodies often presents editorial challenges, especially on repeats. One often finds that there are too few or too many notes for the number of syllables. The easiest solution is to break longer notes into shorter repeated ones (for example, two crotchets instead of a minim; a repeated note indicates a change of syllable) or vice versa: some degree of licence is

necessary, particularly where several stanzas are sung to the same tune/strain. It is often necessary to add or omit an upbeat to enable matching stressed syllables with accented beats (so far as is practical). Text underlay is by no means definitive or proscriptive. A flexible approach in performance is essential.

Shakespeare often integrates speech and sung snatches. Where snatches of tunes are sung it is even conjectural to suggest which part of the tune was sung. Most often the logical answer is the start. Shakespeare's references to the original ballad texts are often approximate or deliberately parodic. Thus a number of reconstructions have been offered in the edition, in an attempt to marry what we know of the tunes to the texts of the plays. These range from sung snatches of ballad tunes to the parodic and mad songs of Ophelia. In such cases the endeavour is entirely speculative and intended only as a potential illustration. Here again we must acknowledge our notation bias. The function of these songs was partly to evoke a connection with the audience: they were expected to know the original and to make connections with it, recognising deviations as symptomatic of mental anguish or instability. By presenting the words with the tune it is not to imply that the words were the only aspect that could be garbled. The apparent fixity of the notation (pitch and rhythm) is also potentially misleading. The matter was perhaps best summed-up by W. H. Auden (1957: 522) in an exegesis of Ophelia's songs (though the point is widely applicable): 'It is generally desirable that a character who breaks into impromptu song should not have a good voice. ... We are meant to be horrified both by what she sings and by the fact that she sings at all'.

Instrumental music

Several of Shakespeare's plays introduce masques, and there is good reason to assume that some of the material was drawn from court masques given by the company. Masque music is, however, fraught with difficulty. Much of it has simply not survived. The vocal music survives in adapted forms. The instrumental music has suffered a similar fate, compounded by the way in which masque music was composed. We know from court payment records that compositional duties were strictly demarcated (for a detailed discussion, see Holman, 1993; Walls, 1996; Cunningham, 2013). Different people composed vocal and instrumental music. The task of composing involved producing a treble and bass outline; to this, inner parts were added by a second person. The creative process means that where this music has survived it has generally come to us in two-part form. The largest collection of this type is British Library Add. 10444, which contains 138 dances apparently from masques from the first quarter of the century. In the 1950s and 1960s especially much ink was split trying to match these dances to specific works through their titles. However, for the most part the titles appear to refer to individual performers and not to the overall work. Fundamentally the endeavour was flawed. This means that identification of a piece with an individual masque is at best circumstantial, even more so than with theatre songs.

Play texts tend to give little detail though in two instances we may perhaps infer connections with two of Jonson's masques. It is possible that the '... *dance of twelve satyrs*' in *The Winter's Tale* (4.4) re-used the antimasque dance from *Oberon*. The servant notes that three of the dancers 'hath danced before the king' (4.4.35–36). The King's Men had performed in the court masque on 1 January 1611; the play was in the Globe by 15 May. What seems likely to be the original dance survives in tune and bass format in British Library, Add. MS 10444, where it is titled 'The Satyres Masque'. A four-part version was published in Thomas Simpson's last collection, *Taffle-Consort* (Hamburg, 1621). Simpson (1582–c. 1628) was an expatriate English musician who spent much of his life working in mainland Europe. The consort version is untitled but attributed to Robert Johnson. We can be reasonably certain that this dance was from *Oberon*. Johnson was paid for 'making Daunces' of the masque. Simpson's arrangement of 'The Satyrs' Dance' is in an up-to-date two-treble four-part scoring. In the masque, the dance would most likely have been performed by the violin band which used a five-part, single treble scoring. The opening of 'The Satyrs' Dance' is reminiscent of the 'First Witches' Dance' from *The Masque of Queens*, which may have been re-used in Middleton's adaption of *Macbeth*. The masque was given at court on 2 February 1609 by the King's Men. It seems that Middleton's *The Witch*

was written between 1609 and 1616. It includes a direction for a dance of witches: 'here they Dance the witches Dance and exit', which Stern suggests implies that it was a dance already known to the company (2009: 152). In *Macbeth* (4.1) there is the direction for 'Music. The Witches dance, and vanish'. This may refer to a generic instruction rather than a reference to a specific dance in the repertoire. We do not know who composed the instrumental music for *The Masque of Queens*. The two witches' dances from the antimasque are, however, generally ascribed to Robert Johnson.

While it is tempting to flesh out our understanding of Shakespeare's theatre by the inclusion of these dances it would be based on entirely circular arguments given that their inclusion in an edition of the Jonson masques is itself largely circumstantial (the interested reader is instead referred to the available modern editions: Sabol, 1982; Cunningham, 2014). This is arguably the most challenging task for the editor: deciding where to draw the line.

¹ The fullest accounts may be found in the entries in *Grove Music Online* and in *BDECM*.

² The practice was familiar to Shakespeare's contemporaries. David Lindley points out that Thomas Campion described the same process almost fifty years earlier, in his address 'To the Reader' from his *Two Books of Ayres* (c.1613): 'These Ayres were for the most part framed at first for one voice with the Lute, or Violl, but upon occasion, they haue since beene filled with more parts, which whose please may vse, who like not may leaue. Yet doe wee daily obserue, that when any shall sing a Treble to an Instrument, the standers by will be offering at an inward part out of their owne nature; and true or false, out it must, though to the peruerting of the whole harmonie'.

³ THE FIRST BOOKE OF CON-sort Lessons, made [i.e. composed] by diuers exqui-site Authors, for six Instruments to play together, the Treble Lute, the Pandora, the Cittern, the Base-Violl, the Flute & Treble-Violl Newly set forth [i.e. arranged] at the coast & charges of a Gentle-man, for his pri-uate pleasure, and for diuers o-thers his friends which de-ligh in Musicke.

⁴ The term was coined by Alan Howard in 'Understanding creativity', in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Henry Purcell*, ed. Rebecca Herissone (Farnham, 2012), 65–113, at 97; the concept was introduced by Rebecca Herissone in her doctoral thesis, 'The Theory and Practice of Composition in the English Restoration Period' (University of Cambridge, 1996); see also idem., *Musical Creativity in Restoration England* (Cambridge, 2014).